

Table 12B. Teen CalWORKs Case-Heads, 1998-1999

	CalWORKs/FG				CalWORKs/U			
	Apr 98	Oct 98	Apr 99	Oct 99	Apr 98	Oct 98	Apr 99	Oct 99
Teen Case-Heads	446	396	382	346	95	89	85	79
Percent of All	0.23%	0.21%	0.21%	0.20%	0.25%	0.23%	0.23%	0.22%
All Case-Heads	193,337	185,681	179,961	172,646	38,040	38,117	37,449	35,867

Source: CES match of DPSS administrative records and birth records provided by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services.

Appendix C. Focus Group Protocol

This appendix presents the protocol used for some of the focus groups that CES conducted to provide first-hand information on the kinds of issues that welfare mothers and fathers were confronting during welfare reform. While this particular protocol was used in focus groups that incorporated members of earlier focus groups, the newer groups the newer groups that were conducted used a similar protocol. Details about the groups and the group participants can be found in Appendix A.

Introduction

- ♦ Welcome. Our purpose in conducting this focus group is to help evaluate the effectiveness of (CalWORKs) and GAIN practices—to understand the ones that are working well and the ones that are in need of improvement. In doing this, we want to focus on your experiences with the program since we saw you last—not how the program is supposed to work, BUT what you personally find helpful and unhelpful about the way it actually works for you and your family. Today, we will be asking you to talk about such things as: What are your greatest needs with regard to your participation in this stage of the program? How do you think the program has worked so far in attempting to meet them? What do you think that the impact of your participation will be on your children and your family? And finally, we are interested in your ideas about how things could be improved.
- ♦ Pass out a sheet with names, address, and phone contact. Also ask for Social Security and case number so that participants who are in some component of GAIN can apply for child care and transportation support.
- ♦ Consent Forms for any new participants.

- ♦ The rules of the group: everyone gets to speak, nobody can dominate the conversation, and one person speaks at a time, great to disagree, but be courteous, maintain confidentiality of group responses.
- ♦ What we will do with the information. We will summarize the results of the focus groups and submit a report to the County as part of its evaluation of CalWORKs. Names of participants and tapes will be confidential and not given to the County. What you say here will have no effect on your evaluation or participation in DPSS, but it could be very helpful in making your opinions known and in improving GAIN.

Evaluation Of Gain Practices

The last time we met, in December, most of you had just attended the orientation meeting. Now we'd like to catch up with what has happened since then in terms of your relationship and experiences with GAIN.

Job Club/Job Search

Let's start with the people who attended Job Club. Be sure to give your name each time you speak.

When you attended Job Club:

What was it like there?

What did they do at Job Club that was helpful to you? (Here probe for good practices, information, and evaluation of the instructor.)

What did they do at Job Club that was not helpful to you?

What happened when you looked for work?

Did GAIN help you get good leads?

What were your main obstacles or problems in getting a job?

For many people, the need for childcare, transportation, and clothes present obstacles to working. Did GAIN help you to deal effectively with these problems?

Did you get a job? If so, tell us a little about it? Please include in your answer whether it is full-time or part-time and whether it is temporary or permanent.

Is the pay adequate? If not, what is GAIN saying that you need to do? Are you going to do this?

Now let's hear from those who did not attend Job Club:

Tell us how things are going for you now?

How are you supporting yourself and your family?

Do you intend to make use of the Job Club and other GAIN services in the future?

Sanctions

Have you been sanctioned at any time?

What happened? What were you sanctioned for?

What impact have the sanctions had on you and your families?

Impact of GAIN on Families: Children

Some people we talked to said they wanted to participate in GAIN because it would help their families.

How many kids do you have and what ages?

What has your family life been like since you have been in the GAIN program?

What are some of the good and bad ways that your participation in GAIN has affected your family life?

Has your participation in GAIN affected your ability to be a good parent? (Here, try to get at what they mean by "good parent," e.g., could be providing adequate supervision to kids, feeling like kids feel proud that they are now working, etc.)

Have changes in your schedule affected your relationship with your kids and your ability to be a good parent?

Do you notice any difference in how your kids are doing in school? (For example, sanctions may force you to move to another school district and this could create problems for the kids. Less time to help them with homework.)

What childcare arrangements have you made for your kids?

How well are they adapting to them?

What concerns do you have availability of childcare?

How do you feel about the quality of childcare?

Do your families feel closer or are there increases in tensions? (Could include more or less patience with kids, more or fewer tensions with husbands/wives.)

Impact of the program on your ability to provide for your families.

If you have gotten a job, has it improved your household income?

Are you making enough money to cover your expenses? (Maybe probe for ways that it might have changed their ability to work on the side.)

Do you think that GAIN provides you with more services to help your family deal with problems when they come up (e.g., greater access to

medical care, school lunch, after school and recreational programs, help for dealing with drug and alcohol problems, delinquency, etc.) ?

**General Evaluation of Practices,
Recommendations**

In December, you expressed mixed feelings about the GAIN program and whether it could help you and your family. Some were optimistic. Others

were pessimistic about the program. Overall, today are you optimistic or pessimistic about the program helping you and your family?

Would you like to recommend anything that could improve GAIN, make it work better for yourself and people like yourself?

Appendix D. Data Needs for the Ongoing Evaluation of Welfare Reform Impacts

To understand the impacts of welfare reform, three types of data are needed. First and simplest, is the existing DPSS data from LEADER that has detailed information on each aided case. A second type is existing data produced by other agencies that are governed by strict confidentiality rules or require supplementation of sample size to be useful. Third are variables not currently tracked with the administrative records. These can be collected through surveys.

Welfare case management systems are complex both because the welfare system is complicated and because the systems have evolved to accommodate a frequently-reformed welfare system.

The following recommendations are made about data needs and their use.

Complete case management coverage. At the time of writing this report, knowledge about the benefit receipt of current and former CalWORKs families came primarily from the DPSS IBPS and CDMS case management systems. As DPSS was in the process of converting to the new LEADER data-reporting system, it was not possible in this report, to report on trends of welfare recipients served by two offices that had been converted to the new system. As the older systems were phased out in favor of LEADER, CES was being supplied information on a dwindling proportion of the DPSS caseload. Future reports will be able to report and analyze data in more detail using data from the LEADER system.

Hours worked. The number of hours worked weekly by employed welfare recipients is one of the key variables required for labor market analysis. DPSS tracks the number of hours usually worked each week by welfare recipients who are registered in the GAIN program. These data were supplied to CES through an extract from

GEARS. Over the first 18 months of reform, the proportion of working recipients registered in GAIN rose from 20 percent to over 50 percent. Tracking the work hours of employed adult welfare recipients, in future reports, will help better understand various aspects of their job stability.

Individual-level K-12 Education Data. These data would allow researchers to monitor how welfare reform might be affecting the school performance and achievement of children of welfare recipients and low-income parents in target school districts. Local school districts track detailed information on grades, classes, attendance and achievement scores for children. These data are highly confidential, but have been released to researchers under strict confidentiality agreements. If policymakers would like to see more research on the impacts of welfare reform on children, they should state this goal to assist researchers in gaining access to such data sources.

Recommendations to Augment Existing

Surveys

Welfare Leavers

With record numbers of welfare recipients leaving the welfare rolls, the importance of tracking what happens to the newly independent welfare leavers has increased. The CES team has received more inquiries about the status of welfare leavers than other segments of the welfare population. However, CES possesses very little local data on welfare leavers. This makes it difficult to answer interesting questions about how leavers are faring economically. In addition, it means researchers have greater difficulty anticipating when, whether, or to what extent welfare leavers might return to

the welfare rolls in the event of economic downturn.

The leavers surveys currently available do not include adequate numbers of Angelenos for drawing inferences about outcomes of concern to CES. The Urban Institute has already conducted two waves (1997 and 1999) of an in-depth family survey in 13 states including California. Their National Survey of America's Families is the leading countrywide source of data on welfare leavers at present, but this data source is not adequate for analysis at the level of Los Angeles County. The United States Department of Health and Human Services has funded a survey of welfare leavers in Los Angeles and Cleveland that is being conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). Though small, the Los Angeles sample from the MDRC project should be adequate to support some statistical analysis once it becomes available.

Welfare Eligibles

Some of the most striking consequences of welfare reform are thought to affect welfare-eligible parents who are saving their time-limited welfare for rainier days as well as the welfare leavers mentioned above. Researchers need more data on this at-risk population. Such data would allow researchers to answer questions about how at-risk parents are adjusting to the new reforms, and whether there are potential policy innovations that might help the eligible population remain independent of the welfare system. Both the Urban Institute survey and the Current Population Survey administered by the Census Bureau are established surveys asking important questions of this population. Sample sizes for these surveys do not adequately cover the at-risk population in Los Angeles County to support meaningful analysis.

Recommendations to Develop and Monitor New Indicators

Job skill indicators. Job skill indicators would allow researchers to better estimate the job prospects of recipients to anticipate future caseload changes caused by industry and cyclical economic growth fluctuations. The research effort would benefit from literacy, education, skill measures, and work experience information for recipient adults who work or might feasibly work. These data are collected by DPSS only for some of the recipients who are enrolled in the GAIN program. Although CES is constructing work experience indicators for individuals from administrative Unemployment Insurance records, other skill measures must be identified using survey approaches.

Job characteristics. Labor market research should be based on data on the job characteristics (e.g., hourly wage, hours, industry) of welfare recipients who are working but are not enrolled in the GAIN program in addition to GAIN enrollees. At the time of writing this report, researchers had access only to job characteristics of working recipients enrolled in the GAIN program. Over the first 18 months of reform, the proportion of working recipients enrolled in GAIN has risen from 20 percent to over 50 percent. Job and skill characteristics of former GAIN participants should be tracked through other administrative records to measure levels of self-sufficiency.

Homelessness. Homelessness is an extreme form of social and economic dislocation. Increases in homelessness from any cause are grounds for concern, while decreases ought to be noted as the possible result of policy successes. Since increased homelessness is a possible side-effect of welfare reform, the welfare evaluation effort might benefit from a regular survey of homeless shelters about the families with minor children that they serve. At present, the characteristics and size of the Los Angeles County homeless population are not well known. National

data indicate that homeless families tend to be headed by women who are frequently former or current welfare recipients.¹⁵⁹ The County should investigate approaches to monitoring the homeless population, possibly in partnership with

social service providers and researchers. Ongoing efforts to assess the numbers of families assisted by other private sector service providers such as food banks could also be helpful.

Appendix E. Glossary

Term	Actual Title (if any)	Explanation
AB 1542	The Thompson-Maddy-Ducheny-Ashburn Welfare-to-Work Act of 1997	The bill, signed by Governor Pete Wilson on August 11, 1997, that created CalWORKs.
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children	Program started in the 1930s as Aid to Dependent Children, replaced under PRWORA with TANF.
APP	Alternative Payment Program	An agency that handles payments for child care services. DPSS has contracts with ten APPs, all of which are also R&Rs (see R&R below).
CalWORKs	California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program	California's implementation of TANF cash assistance. Features work requirements, time limits, etc.
CAO	Chief Administrative Office	The Chief Administrative Office of the County of Los Angeles provides fiscal and policy recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and gives the Board administrative assistance in implementing policy decisions.
CAPI	California Assistance Program for Immigrants	CAPI provides cash support to most immigrants who became ineligible for SSI due to the immigrant exclusions in PRWORA but who are otherwise eligible for SSI.
CDF	Children's Defense Fund	A Washington, D.C.-based, private, nonprofit organization dedicated to protecting and representing the interests of underprivileged children.
CDHS	California Department of Health Services	California State agency
CDMS	Caseload Data Management System	DPSS case management system for GR and Medi-Cal; rendered obsolete by LEADER.
CDSS	California Department of Social Services	California State agency responsible for Statewide implementation of welfare reform.
CES	CalWORKs Evaluation Services	Formerly part of Urban Research, CES is now a unit within the CAO Service Integration Branch. CES is responsible for the evaluation of CalWORKs in Los Angeles County of which this report is a part.
CFAP	California Food Assistance Program	CAPI provides assistance to most immigrants who became ineligible for Food Stamps due to the immigrant exclusions in PRWORA but who are otherwise eligible for Food Stamps.
CPS	Current Population Survey	A monthly survey of about 50,000 households conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The CPS is the primary source of information on the labor force characteristics of the U.S. population such as employment, unemployment, earnings, hours of work, and other indicators.
DCFS	Department of Children and Family Services	Los Angeles County agency responsible for handling cases of child abuse and neglect.


Term	Actual Title (if any)	Explanation
DCSS	Los Angeles County Department of Community and Senior Services	Handles services to seniors and refugees; contracting with DPSS to provide welfare-to-work services to certain foreign language participants.
DHS	Department of Health Services	Los Angeles County agency.
DMH	Department of Mental Health	Los Angeles County agency.
DPSS	Department of Public Social Services	Los Angeles County agency delivering administering social services, including CalWORKs, Food Stamps, and Medi-Cal.
EDD	Employment Development Department	Manages California's Unemployment Insurance (UI) program. Monitors employment at most establishments in the State.
EITC	Earned Income Tax Credit	Federal subsidy to low income wage earners.
FG	Family Group	A term DPSS uses to denote that particular benefits are being received in a single parent household, e.g. AFDC/FG
FPL	Federal Poverty Level	The administrative version of the poverty measure issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. It is a simplification of the Poverty Thresholds and is used in determining financial eligibility for certain Federal programs.
GAIN	Greater Avenues for Independence	Los Angeles County Welfare-to-Work program.
GEARS	GAIN Employment and Activity Reporting System	Computer system used for tracking GAIN participants.
GR	General Relief	Cash assistance to indigent adults. Same as General Assistance.
IBPS	Integrated Benefit Payment System	DPSS case management system for CalWORKs and Food Stamps; rendered obsolete by LEADER.
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act	Major Federal job training program. Cooperates at the State level with the EDD.
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District	The public school district for the City of Los Angeles, LAUSD serves an area of 704 square miles, including several other cities—Cudahy, Gardena, Huntington Park, Lomita, Maywood, San Fernando, Vernon, West Hollywood, and portions of 20 other cities and additional Los Angeles County areas. The total k-12 enrollment exceeds 720,000.
LACOE	Los Angeles County Office of Education	State-funded organization providing educational services within the County.
LEADER	Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting	New system replacing CDMS, IBPS, and WCMIS; began operational testing on May 3, 1999 in one office.
LEP	Limited English Proficiency	Classification given to students in Los Angeles County Schools if English is not their primary language and they possess only a limited capacity to speak and write in English.

Term	Actual Title (if any)	Explanation
MAP	Maximum Aid Payment	Maximum cash grant size for a given family. The family receives a percentage of the MAP depending on other resources, income, and special circumstances.
MBSAC	Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care	Standard established by the CDSS as an absolute minimum required income for a family of a given size. Used as a maximum income level for establishing cash aid eligibility. Roughly 70 percent of the equivalent United States Bureau of the Census-established Poverty Threshold.
MDRC	Manpower Development Research Corporation	Private non-profit organization that specializes in the evaluation of work-related social programs, especially those that include training.
Medi-Cal		California's Federally-funded Medicare program. Provides health insurance to poor families and individuals. All CalWORKs families are eligible for Medi-Cal assistance.
MEDS	Medi-Cal Eligibility Determination System	Computer system monitoring public assistance Statewide.
NSLP	National School Lunch Program	Established in 1946 under the National School Lunch Act signed by President Truman, the National School Lunch Program is a Federally assisted meal program that operates in approximately 96,000 public and nonprofit private schools and residential childcare centers, providing low-cost or free lunches to roughly 27 million children each school day.
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996	Federal Welfare reform act (PL 104-193).
PUMS	Public Use Microdata Samples	These files generated by the Census Bureau contain records for a sample of housing units with information on the characteristics of each unit and each person in it for areas with population groups of 100,000 or more.
R&R	Resource and Referral Agency	Organization providing referrals for child care services. (See APP)
SIB	Service Integration Branch	Branch of the Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Office created in 2000 to facilitate collaboration between County departments and between County departments and the private sector in the provision of services to the public.
SIP	Self-Initiated Program	Educational program pursued by GAIN participants on personal initiative.
SSI	Supplemental Security Income	Federal cash aid program, mainly benefits aged or permanently disabled adults, although children may be eligible as well.
SSP	Supplementary State Program	State-funded supplement to SSI intended to ensure an adequate standard of living for SSI recipients.

Term	Actual Title (if any)	Explanation
STF	Summary Tape Files	These files generated by the Census Bureau contain information on population and household characteristics compiled from the short-form questionnaires of the Decennial Census.
TANF	Temporary Aid to Needy Families	Federal cash aid program with time limits and work requirements. It replaced AFDC in 1996.
U	Unemployed Parent	A term DPSS uses to denote that particular benefits are being received in a two parent household, e.g., AFDC/U.
UI	Unemployment Insurance	Cash assistance for unemployed workers. Benefits depend on past wages and employment; not all former workers are eligible.
UR	Urban Research	A unit within the CAO SIB. UR provides research and planning services to various County agencies.
WCMIS	Welfare Case Management Information System	DPSS case management system; shared with DCFS; rendered obsolete by LEADER.

Appendix F. Welfare Reform Timeline

Date	Event
August 22, 1996	Federal Welfare Reform Legislation Signed into Law (Federal) Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) signed into law.
August 22, 1996	SSI/SSP for Legal Immigrants (Federal) New applications for SSI/SSP benefits from non-exempt legal immigrants are denied based on citizenship status.
September 22, 1996	Food Stamps for Legal Immigrants (Federal) New applications for Food Stamps from non-exempt legal immigrants are denied based on citizenship status.
October 17, 1996	Citizenship Outreach Program (County) Los Angeles County initiates a special mailer to 140,000 legal immigrant SSI recipients, informing them of the impact of Welfare Reform on their eligibility for benefits and encouraging them to pursue naturalization.
November 26, 1996	Approval of California State Plan (State) The Federal government approves the California preliminary TANF block grant plan.
December 16, 1996	Citizenship Outreach Program (County) Los Angeles County begins to screen all applicants for assistance to identify legal immigrants in order to inform them of the possible effects of Welfare Reform and to provide them with information on how to apply for citizenship.
December 31, 1996	Federal Five-Year Clock Begins (Federal) The Federal government begins counting time on aid against the five-year lifetime limit.
December 31, 1996	Disability Related to Drug/Alcohol Abuse (Federal) Benefits terminated for those Social Security Disability Insurance and SSI/SSP beneficiaries whose disability was related to drug addiction or alcoholism.
December 31, 1996	Maximum Family Grant (State) Families will not receive cash assistance for children born after implementation of this provision if they have been continuously on aid for 10 months prior to the birth. However, the child will be eligible for Medi-Cal and Food Stamps. Exemptions may be granted for children conceived as a result of rape, incest, or certain failed contraceptive methods.
January 1, 1997	AFDC Grant Reduction (State) AFDC grants reduced by 4.9 percent across the board in California.
February 1, 1997	SSA Notification Letter to Legal Immigrant Recipients of SSI (Federal) SSA begins to notify legal immigrant recipients of the possible termination of SSI benefits.

 Date	Event
March 1, 1997	Welfare Reform Hot Line (County) The toll-free Welfare Reform Hot line number (1-888-3WELFAR) is up and working in Los Angeles County. This hot line provides updated information on program implementation, legislative issues and community advocacy meetings.
May 1, 1997	Teen Pregnancy Disincentive (Federal) With limited exceptions, never-married pregnant or parenting minors under 18 years of age must live with a parent, legal guardian or other adult relative, or in an adult supervised supportive living arrangement as a condition of AFDC eligibility.
August 5, 1997	Restoration of SSI Benefits for Most Legal Aliens (Federal) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 signed into law on August 5, 1997, restored SSI benefits for most legal aliens that were impacted by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996.
August 11, 1997	State Legislation Enacted (State) Governor signs legislation (AB 1542), replacing AFDC with CalWORKs.
August 18, 1997	State Legislation on Substance Abuse Enacted (State) Governor signs AB 1260, legislation that makes any person convicted after December 31, 1997 of a drug-related felony permanently ineligible for aid.
September 1, 1997	Food Stamps for Legal Immigrants (State) Non-exempt legal immigrants currently receiving Food Stamps benefits lose these benefits. Governor signed AB 1576, creating a special State Food Assistance Program (FAP) effective this date for non-disabled adults 65 years or older and for minors under 18 years old.
September 1, 1997	Food Stamps Work Requirement (Federal) New Food Stamps work requirement (which limits Food Stamps benefits for able-bodied adults between 18 and 50 without dependent children, to three months in three years, except for persons in work, training or Workfare) will be implemented. People subject to this requirement who also receive General Relief will be able to maintain their Food Stamps by continuing to participate in the County's General Relief Workfare program. Los Angeles County will offer Workfare to other Food Stamps recipients subject to this work requirement to enable them to retain their Food Stamps.
September 10, 1997	State's Planning Allocation Letter (State) Issuance by State of a planning allocation and county plan instructions 30 days after enactment of AB 1542.
September 30, 1997 (Federal Fiscal Year End)	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 25 percent of all families and 75 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties. Having earned a caseload reduction credit, California was given a reduced target to meet.

Date	Event
January 1, 1998	CalWORKs Grant Computation (State) CalWORKs changes the method for computing earned income. Net earned income is determined by deducting the first \$225 of the gross plus 50 percent of the remainder. The net income is deducted from the Maximum Aid Payment. A separate child care provider payment is required instead of adjusting the monthly gross income with a standard disregard amount for child care expenses incurred.
January 1, 1998	Five Year Clock Starts (State) California begins counting time on aid against the State five-year lifetime limit. State funds will be used to pay for aided persons who reach the Federal limit before they reach the State limit. With few exceptions, there will only be discrepancies between the State and Federal time limits for those on aid before January 1, 1998.
January 10, 1998	Submission of County Plan (State) County to submit plan for implementation of CalWORKs within four months of the issuance of the planning allocation letter.
February 9, 1998	State Certification of County Plan (State) CDSS has 30 days to either certify the plan or notify the County that the plan is not complete or consistent with statutory requirements.
February 22, 1998	SSI/SSP for Children (Federal) Deadline for SSI reassessment for disabled children. Disability criteria changed. Behavior impairments such as Attention Deficit Disorder will not be considered a disabling condition. This deadline was extended from August 22, 1997 to February 22, 1998.
April 1, 1998	CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work Launched in Los Angeles County (County) County began enrolling all new non-exempt applicants for aid into the welfare-to-work program. Welfare-to-work plans signed on or after April 1 start the 18/24 month time limit.
September 1, 1998	California Food Assistance Program Begins (State) The California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) provides State-funded food assistance benefits to certain otherwise-eligible immigrants who became ineligible for Federal Food Stamps under PRWORA. This mainly benefits immigrants between 18 and 65 years old who were in the country on August 22, 1996.
October 1, 1998	Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants Begins (State) The Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) provides State-funded cash assistance to certain otherwise-eligible disabled or elderly immigrants who became ineligible for SSI/SSP (Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment) under PRWORA. This mainly benefits certain immigrants who were in the country on August 22, 1996.
September 30, 1998 (Federal Fiscal Year End)	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 30 percent of all families and 75 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties. California failed to meet the requirement for two-parent families. Having earned a caseload reduction credit, California was given a reduced target to meet.

Date	Event
November 1, 1998	CalWORKs Grant Increase (State) The State restored the 4.9 percent previously cut, and added a 2.84 percent Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) increase.
January 1, 1999	Enrollment of Recipients into Welfare-to-Work Program (State) County must enroll all non-exempt CalWORKs recipients in welfare-to-work services by the end of 1998.
July 1, 1999	CalWORKs COLA Increase (State) CalWORKs grants scheduled for 2.36 percent COLA increase.
September 30, 1999 (End of Federal Fiscal Year)	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 35 percent of all families and 90 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties. Required work participation rate is reduced by caseload reduction credit.
October 1, 1999	Creation of Separate State Program for Two-Parent Families (State) Effective this date, two-parent families are aided using State, rather than Federal funds, ensuring that California will not be penalized for its two-parent employment rate.
October 1, 1999	Time-limited CFAP and CAPI Begins (State) AB 1111 created time-limited food (CFAP) and cash (CAPI) assistance programs for many otherwise-eligible immigrants who arrived in the United States after August 22, 1996. These are in effect from October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000-.
October 1, 1999	First Recipients Exceed 18/24 Month Limit Some non-exempt adults who have been on aid continuously since January 1, 1998, and who do not meet employment requirements will be required to participate in community service employment in order to continue receiving the adult portion of their family's grant. Recipients in community service employment still count toward the State's TANF MOE requirement.
September 30, 2000 (End of Federal Fiscal Year)	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 40 percent of all families and 90 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties.
October 1, 2000	Time-limited CFAP and CAPI Extended (State) AB 2876 extended the time-limited food (CFAP) and cash (CAPI) assistance programs for otherwise-eligible immigrants who arrived in the United States after August 22, 1996. These are now in effect from October 1, 2000 to September 30, 2001.
September 30, 2001 (End of Federal Fiscal Year)	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 45 percent of all families and 90 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties.
September 30, 2002 (Federal Fiscal Year End) and all subsequent years	TANF Work Participation Rates (State) California must ensure that 50 percent of all families and 90 percent of two-parent families meet welfare-to-work participation requirements or face penalties.

Date	Event
January 1, 2003	<p>Recipients First Begin to Exceed Five Year Limit</p> <p>Non-exempt aided adults who have been on aid continuously since April 1, 1998, are no longer eligible for aid. No more than 20 percent of the current <i>Federally-funded</i> caseload can be exempted from this time limit. (California may elect to support as many additional time-expired participants as it chooses with State funds.)</p>

Endnotes

¹ Population estimate is an Urban Research estimate for 1999. The number of persons aided under CalWORKs in April 1999 was 649,000 according to The Department of Public Social Services April 1999 Statistical Report.

² To phrase this differently, all else being equal, poor families in general and welfare families in particular will tend to congregate in areas with low housing costs, and, because they often lack access to reliable cars, adequate public transportation access. One factor that may not be "equal" is race; racial discrimination in housing can severely constrain residential choices for African Americans and is a lesser but still important constraint for Latinos. See, e.g., Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

³ Gwendolyn Mink, *Welfare's End* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 1.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Joel F. Handler and Yeheskel Hasenfeld, *We the Poor People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998)

⁶ The figure of \$793 is the Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care (MBSAC) for a family living in Region 1 of California (which includes Los Angeles County), effective July 1, 1999. (An increase to \$816 became effective on October 1, 2000. Because this report covers trends only through 1999, we have chosen to use the benefit calculations and eligibility criteria that were in effect on December 31, 1999.) There are a number of special rules regarding resource limits. For example, if the family car is worth \$4,650 or more, the excess above \$4,650 is counted against the resource limit, unless the car is used to transport a disabled person, in which case it is not counted. The resource limit is \$2,000 unless someone in the family is over age 60, in which case the limit becomes \$3,000. The value of a house that the family lives in is not counted against the resource limit.

⁷ James Riccio, Daniel Friedlander, and Stephen Freedman, *GAIN: Benefits, Costs, and Three-Year Impacts of a Welfare-to-Work Program* (New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1994).

⁸ Evan Weissman, *Changing to a Work First Strategy: Lessons from Los Angeles County's GAIN Program for Welfare Recipients* (New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1997).

⁹ The MFG program was adopted under one of California's four Federally approved "waivers" of then-extant AFDC rules. Newborns who are excluded from cash aid under MFG are still able to receive Medi-Cal and Food Stamps unless they are ineligible for some other reason.

¹⁰ In more technical terms, parents who are not exempt from welfare-to-work requirements and who do not demonstrate good cause for failing to comply with GAIN work requirements will be sanctioned.

¹¹ This is a family in which all three persons are aided and which has no cash income outside of CalWORKs assistance. It is also a "non-exempt" family; families are considered "exempt" and are eligible for higher aid payments when each of the adult caretaker relatives (whether parents or others) is either in the "Assistance Unit" (the children and their primary caretakers) and receiving State Disability Insurance (SDI), In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), State Security Payment (SSP), Temporary Workers' Compensation (TWC), or Temporary Disability Indemnity (TDI), or is a non-needy non-parent caretaker relative not included in the Assistance Unit.

-
- ¹² The current Community Service program in Los Angeles County is unwaged, but there are plans to implement a wage-based system once the State has issued new regulations to facilitate the creation of such a program. Communication from DPSS, dated February 7, 2001.
- ¹³ Of the \$500 the parent earned, \$225 plus half of the remainder—\$137.50—do not count against the family grant. Thus, the \$626 family grant (assuming there is no other reason that this would be reduced from the maximum) is reduced by \$137.50, yielding a grant of \$488.50. The \$500 earnings plus the grant add up to \$988.50. Note that the greater income of welfare recipients who work is not a pure incentive; wage labor normally entails increased expenses for transportation, child care, appropriate clothing, meals taken outside the home, etc. DPSS provides additional funds to help with transportation and child care expenses, while increased income helps offset remaining expenses.
- ¹⁴ United Way of Greater Los Angeles, "Executive Summary of the State of the County Report". In *A Tale of Two Cities. Promise & Peril in Los Angeles* (Los Angeles, CA: United Way of Greater Los Angeles, 1999), 5.
- ¹⁵ United Way of Greater Los Angeles, "Executive Summary of the State of the County Report". In *A Tale of Two Cities. Promise & Peril in Los Angeles* (Los Angeles, CA: United Way of Greater Los Angeles, 1999).
- ¹⁶ Another criterion was that our communities should, to the greatest extent practical, overlap with areas being studied by other research organizations. The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, for instance, is conducting ethnographic research in Boyle Heights, Athens/Willowbrook (which overlaps the area we call Westmont), and Central Long Beach, all of which are included in our community areas.
- ¹⁷ Most community-level statistics are 1998 estimates based on the 1990 Census and more recent Current Population Surveys. The proportion of local residents who receive CalWORKs aid is based on August 1998 CalWORKs data and 1998 population estimates.
- ¹⁸ Administrative Memorandum 99-42, 11/22/99.
- ¹⁹ Among the eligibility restrictions new in CalWORKs are the requirement that single teen parents live with their own parents, and the ineligibility for aid of drug felons and fleeing felons.
- ²⁰ Questions remain about the non-approvals that were also not denials. DPSS has indicated that the non-denial non-approvals were all (or almost all) voluntary withdrawals. That so many applicants should withdraw their applications each month requires some explanation. DPSS has also indicated that the new LEADER computer system should allow DPSS staff to make an official eligibility determination while the applicant is still in the office, possibly reducing the number of application withdrawals.
- ²¹ The entry and exit trends can also be seen as lagged versions of each other. That is, the rise and fall in exit rates that began in the late 1980s strongly resembled the rise and fall of entry rates that began in the early 1990s.
- ²² Mary Jo Bane and David Elwood, *Welfare Realities: From Rhetoric to Reform* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997).
- ²³ Mary Jo Bane and David Elwood, *Welfare Realities: From Rhetoric to Reform* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997), 41.
- ²⁴ Mary Jo Bane and David Elwood, *Welfare Realities: From Rhetoric to Reform* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997).

-
- ²⁵ Pamela Loprest. *Families Who Leave Welfare: Who Are They And How Are They Doing?* Assessing The New Federalism Series, no. 99-02 (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1999).
- ²⁶ This cuts both ways, however; though less successful families may face housing instability, more successful families may be able to move to better neighborhoods.
- ²⁷ State of California form ABCD 253 (2/94), CalWORKs-Family Groups and Unemployed Report on reasons for discontinuance of cash grant, completed for Los Angeles County by DPSS.
- ²⁸ DPSS has also suggested that a significant number of terminations may be families with parents who are already working, but not reporting their income. When required to participate in GAIN, DPSS suggests, these families terminate their cases instead. (Communication from Henry E. Felder, Chief, Research, Statistics, and Evaluation Division of DPSS to Wayne Bannister, Assistant Division Chief, Urban Research Division, dated August 16, 2000.) It is more likely that a parent working 'under the table' would take a sanction for noncompliance, losing only a portion of their family grant, rather than terminate and lose the whole grant. This is speculation on both sides; no analysis presently available supports these positions. While studies of AFDC recipients do suggest that many regularly fail to report income from odd jobs and short-term employment (see Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making ends meet: how single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997)), It is not known how the existence of mandatory work requirements and sanctions for noncompliance under TANF affect this aspect of the behavior of welfare recipients. Where monthly unreported income is less than or not much greater than the portion of the grant that would be lost with a sanction, the incentives to the recipients would be for them to participate in the welfare-to-work program, giving up (or reporting) their off-the-books activities.
- ²⁹ See Rebecca Blank, "Analyzing the Length of Welfare Spells." *Journal of Public Economics* 39 (1989), 245-73; John Fitzgerald, "Welfare Durations and the Marriage Market: Evidence from the Survey of Income and Program Participation." *Journal of Human Resources*, 26 (1991), 545-61; LaDonna A. Pavetti, "The Dynamics of Welfare and Work: Exploring the Process by which Young Women Work their Way Off Welfare." Ph.D. diss., (Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1993).
- ³⁰ Mary Jo Bane and David Elwood, *Welfare Realities: From Rhetoric to Reform* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997).
- ³¹ See Mary Jo Bane and David Elwood, *Welfare Realities: From Rhetoric to Reform* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997), and LaDonna A. Pavetti, "Who is Affected by Time Limits?" in *Welfare Reform: An Analysis of the Issues*. Ed. Isabel V. Sawhill. (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1995).
- ³² Greg J. Duncan, Kathleen Mullan, and Johanne Boisjoly, *Time Limits and Welfare Reform: How Many Families Will be Affected?* (Evanston, Illinois: Institute for Policy Research, March 1998).
- ³³ LaDonna A. Pavetti, "Who is Affected by Time Limits?" Chapter 7 in *Welfare Reform: An Analysis of the Issues*. Ed. Isabel V. Sawhill. (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1995).
- ³⁴ Greg J. Duncan, Kathleen Mullan, and Johanne Boisjoly, *Time Limits and Welfare Reform: How Many Families Will be Affected?* (Evanston, Illinois: Institute for Policy Research, March 1998).
- ³⁵ The Urban Institute Fast Facts, "Welfare reform and children of immigrants", (Internet, WWW) <http://www.urban.org/immig/fixfacts.html> (Accessed 2 February 2000).

³⁶ Wendy Zimmermann and Karen Tumlin, *Patchwork Policies: State Assistance for Immigrants under Welfare Reform* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, March, 1999). (Internet, WWW) <http://newFederalism.urban.org/html/occa24.html> (Accessed 2 February 2000).

³⁷ The Urban Institute Checkpoints, "New Medicaid and Welfare Cases in Los Angeles County Drop Because Fewer Immigrants Apply" (Internet, WWW) <http://www.urban.org/news/press/cpLAim.html> (Accessed 15 February 2000).

³⁸ Because DPSS was unable to provide caseload data predating April 1998, it was not possible to verify that the calculations made for this report were entirely comparable to those made by the Urban Institute. Although CES is generally confident about the time series shown in Figure 10, CES is also cognizant that new AFDC/CalWORKs cases might have been identified differently by the Urban Institute and by CES, and feel that this could explain part of the large drop in the number of children in new cases between October 1997 and April 1998, as shown in Table 4. Since it is the proportional composition of new cases rather than the absolute number in each category that are of interest in Figure 10 and Table 4, CES is not overly concerned.

³⁹ The study also found declines in approved applications by legal immigrants and non-English speakers for standalone Medi-Cal and for General Relief.

⁴⁰ Wendy Zimmermann and Michael Fix, "Declining Immigrant Applications for Medi-Cal and Welfare Benefits in Los Angeles County". The Urban Institute, July 1998, [(Internet, WWW) <http://www.urban.org/immig/lacounty.html>] (Accessed 2 February 2000).

⁴¹ Michael Fix and Jeffrey Passel, J. "Trends in Noncitizen's and Citizen's Use of Public Benefits Following Welfare Reform: 1994-97". The Urban Institute, March, 1999 (Internet, WWW) <http://www.urban.org/immig/trends.html> (Accessed 2 February 2000).

⁴² Wendy Zimmermann and Michael Fix, "Declining Immigrant Applications for Medi-Cal and Welfare Benefits in Los Angeles County". The Urban Institute, July 1998, [Internet, WWW] <http://www.urban.org/immig/lacounty.html> [Accessed 2 February 2000].

⁴³ Michael Fix and Karen Tumlin, *Welfare Reform and the Devolution of Immigrant Policy*, New Federalism Series, no. A-15 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, October 1997).

⁴⁴ In the cases where there are two parents, both may be sanctioned under some circumstances. Please see Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness, *The People's Guide to Welfare, Health and Other Services in Los Angeles County: How to get Food and Money*, 26th ed. (Los Angeles, CA: L.A. Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness, Publisher, Summer 1999). (Internet, WWW) <http://www.peoplesguide.org> (Accessed February 2000).

⁴⁵ CalWORKs eligibility and GAIN workers were interviewed in December 1998 and June 1999. In these first interviews workers spoke of their initial misunderstanding of program requirements and sanctions as well as their hope that through increased training sanctioning would be much easier to apply to non-compliant participants. In the second round, workers spoke of an increased understanding of regulations and appropriate use of penalties and sanctions due to formal and more importantly, on the job training.

⁴⁶ United States Department of Health and Human Services, "Frequently Asked Questions About Child-only Cases." (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation Human Services Policy Brief, September 1999).

-
- ⁴⁷ United States Department of Health and Human Services, "Frequently Asked Questions About Child-only Cases." (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation Human Services Policy Brief, September 1999), 3.
- ⁴⁸ Note that, as mentioned earlier, only the parents' portion of the grant is subject to time limits. In addition, at the State's discretion, up to 20 percent of parents aided with Federal funds can be exempted from the time limits, and states can choose to extend time limits even further—although completely at their own expense.
- ⁴⁹ Robert Rector and Sarah Youssef, "The Determinants of Welfare Caseload Decline" (Heritage Foundation working paper, 1999).
- ⁵⁰ Council of Economic Advisers, *Technical Report: Explaining the Decline in Welfare Receipt, 1993–1996* (Washington, DC: Council of Economic Advisers, 1997).
- ⁵¹ Geoffrey Wallace and Rebecca Blank. "What Goes Up Must Come Down? Explaining Recent Changes in Public Assistance Caseloads" (Paper presented at the Welfare Reform and the Macroeconomy Conference sponsored by the Joint Center for Poverty Research, February 1999).
- ⁵² As of January 28, 2000, the United States Bureau of Economic Analysis estimates that real GDP grew 4.5 per cent from 1996–97, 4.3 per cent from 1997–98, and 4.0 per cent from 1998–99.
- ⁵³ "Real" wages are wages adjusted for changes in the cost of living. Adjustments are typically made through use of the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), which is computed monthly by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The CPI indicates that, overall, consumer prices in 1980 were just 46 percent of what they were in 2000. Thus, although the California minimum wage was \$3.10 in "nominal" terms (that is, before adjustment for inflation) in January 1980, in "real" terms, that \$3.10 wage had the purchasing power of a present-day (March 2000) wage of \$6.72.
- ⁵⁴ The Levenson study found that 35 percent of welfare mothers are classified as literacy level 1 (of 5), and another 41 percent are classified at literacy level 2. Literacy level 1 means they can do only very simple tasks like locate the expiration date on a drivers license, total a bank deposit or sign their names. These level-1 individuals cannot do level-2 tasks like locate an intersection on a street map, understand an appliance warranty, or fill out a government benefits application. Higher-order tasks include using a bus schedule, writing a letter to explain a credit card bill error, and using a calculator to determine a 10 per cent discount. Alec Levenson, Elaine Reardon and Stefanie R. Schmidt, *Welfare, Jobs and Basic Skills: The Employment Prospects of Welfare Recipients in the Most Populous U.S. Counties*, NCSALL Reports, no.10B (Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy, April 1999).
- ⁵⁵ Alec Levenson, Elaine Reardon and Stefanie R. Schmidt, *Welfare, Jobs and Basic Skills: The Employment Prospects of Welfare Recipients in the Most Populous U.S. Counties*, NCSALL Reports, no.10B (Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy, April 1999).
- ⁵⁶ Daniel Flaming, Mark Drayse and Peter Force. *On the Edge: A Progress Report On Welfare to Work in Los Angeles* (Los Angeles, CA: Economic Roundtable, 1999).
- ⁵⁷ Robert Spalter-Roth, Beverly Burr, Heidi Hartmann, and Lois Shaw, *Welfare That Works: The Working Lives of AFDC Recipients* (Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research, 1995).
- ⁵⁸ Daniel P. McMurrer, Isabel V. Sawhill and Robert I. Lerman, *Welfare Reform and Opportunity in the Low-Wage Labor Market*, Opportunity in America Series, no. 5. (Washington DC: Urban Institute, 1999).

-
- ⁵⁹ Gary Burtless, "Can the Labor Market Absorb Three Million Welfare Recipients?" *Focus* 19, no. 3 (1998).
- ⁶⁰ Although economic theory suggests that minimum wages reduce labor demand and job opportunities, there is mixed evidence that this has actually occurred when minimum wages have been increased in the past.
- ⁶¹ Daniel P. McMurrer, Isabel V. Sawhill and Robert I. Lerman, *Welfare Reform and Opportunity in the Low-Wage Labor Market*, Opportunity in America Series, no. 5. (Washington DC: Urban Institute, 1999).
- ⁶² See Timothy Bartik, "Displacement and Wage Effects of Welfare Reform" (Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, working paper, 1999). In addition to his own original research on the topic, Bartik presents a good summary of the literature on these adverse impacts.
- ⁶³ California was not penalized, however, because a "caseload reduction credit"—calculated based on the number of families leaving welfare since the enactment of welfare reform—allowed California to meet a reduced requirement. In addition, California has shifted its two-parent cases into a separate state-funded program, as mentioned previously. This allows California to escape the Federal two-parent work requirements.
- ⁶⁴ Earlier in the report, it was reported that the proportion of Los Angeles cases which are child-only has increased significantly over the same time period. Seven out of ten child-only cases are headed by immigrant parents. Overall, child-only cases have risen from 27 percent to 32 percent of the caseload.
- ⁶⁵ Learning the total amount of earnings for each participant is a key part of the monthly grant determination process, and these earnings are tracked. It is the details of hours and hourly wages that may not be tracked.
- ⁶⁶ See Gordon M. Fisher, "The Development and History of the United States Poverty Thresholds—A Brief Overview," GSS/SSS Newsletter (Newsletter of the Government Statistics Section and the Social Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association), Winter (1997): 6-7, available as <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/papers/hptgssiv.htm>.
- ⁶⁷ United States Bureau of the Census, *Poverty Thresholds in 1999, by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years* [HTML] (United States Bureau of the Census, September 26, 2000 [cited January 3 2001]); available from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld/thresh99.html>.
- ⁶⁸ This estimate assumes a parent works full-time at the minimum wage, receives Food Stamps and school meals, as well as the Earned Income Tax Credit. This report compares the parents' resources to the Federal poverty line to determine how many children they can support. This assumes the Federal poverty line is a reasonable measure of the resources needed by Angelenos to support a family at a minimal level of comfort.
- ⁶⁹ Technically, CalWORKs/welfare reform went into effect in California on January 1, 1998, and the 60-month lifetime CalWORKs "clock" starts on that date. The CalWORKs welfare-to-work program was not officially in place in Los Angeles County until April 1, 1998, however. Arguably, April 1, 1998 is when CalWORKs really began in the County. April 1998 is the first month for which CES has administrative records, and it is a reasonable point at which to begin tracking CalWORKs families.
- ⁷⁰ Daniel McKenzie and Stephen H. Bell, *Food Concerns and Affordability, Income and Hardships, Snapshots of America's Families* in "1997 National Survey of America's Families", (Internet, WWW) http://newFederalism.urban.org/nsaf/income_a5.html (Accessed 2 February 2000), 1.
- ⁷¹ Housing costs can easily dominate all other expenses for low-income families. For example, a 1999 Department of Housing and Urban Development report found that nationwide "a record 5.3 million very low-

income renters paid more than 50 percent of their income for rent between 1993 and 1995." Leta Herman, "Section 8 Rental Assistance: Housing You Can Afford," *Los Angeles Times* 1998.

⁷² The Fair Market Rent (FMR) is the 40th percentile rent for a housing unit of a given size. The projected FMR for Los Angeles County for 2001 is \$782 (final FMRs have not differed from projected FMRs during the past several years). This means that 60 percent of local 2-bedrooms cost more than \$782 and 40 percent cost \$782 or less. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, *FMR [Free Market Rent] History 1983 - Present: Data* [DBF (Self-Extracting)] (United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001 [cited January 19 2001]); available from <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/fmr/fmrhist.exe>.

⁷³ Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive On Welfare And Low-Wage Work*. (New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1997).

⁷⁴ It is not clear from the source report whether these estimates apply solely to the City of Los Angeles or are applicable to the County as a whole. Eugene T. Lowe et al., *A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities, 2000: A 25-City Survey* (PDF) (United States Conference of Mayors, December 2000 [cited January 19 2001]); available from <http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/hungersurvey/hunger2000.pdf>.

⁷⁵ Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive On Welfare And Low-Wage Work*. (New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1997).

⁷⁶ According to an article in the industry journal *Realty Times*, the Mayflower Transit Company's 1999 annual report, "America on the Move," reported that about one-sixth of Americans were expected to move during 1999. "20 Million Americans Will Move In Next Three Months." (Internet, WWW) http://realtytimes.com/rtnews/rtcpages/19990525_move.htm (Accessed 29 February 2000).

⁷⁷ Laura Nichols and Barbara Gault, "The Effects of Welfare Reform on Housing Stability and Homelessness: Current Research Findings, Legislation and Programs." *Welfare Reform Network News: A Newsletter of the Institute for Women's Policy Research* 2, no. 2 (March 1999).

⁷⁸ Laura Nichols and Barbara Gault, "The Effects of Welfare Reform on Housing Stability and Homelessness: Current Research Findings, Legislation and Programs." *Welfare Reform Network News: A Newsletter of the Institute for Women's Policy Research* 2, no. 2 (March 1999).

⁷⁹ Eugene T. Lowe et al., *A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities, 2000: A 25-City Survey* (PDF) (United States Conference of Mayors, December 2000 [cited January 19 2001]); available from <http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/hungersurvey/hunger2000.pdf>.

⁸⁰ "Profile of Homelessness: Results from a National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Homeless Persons", (Internet, WWW) <http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/progsys/homeless/profile.htm> (Accessed 17 February 2000).

⁸¹ "Profile of Homelessness: Results from a National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Homeless Persons", (Internet, WWW) <http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/progsys/homeless/profile.htm> (Accessed 17 February 2000).

⁸² "Homeless Fact Sheet 2000", (Internet, WWW) <http://www.peoplesguide.org/lacehh/factsheet.html> (Accessed 2 February 2000).

-
- ⁸³ Laura Nichols and Barbara Gault, "The Effects of Welfare Reform on Housing Stability and Homelessness: Current Research Findings, Legislation and Programs". *Welfare Reform Network News: A Newsletter of the Institute for Women's Policy Research* 2, no. 2 (March 1999), 11.
- ⁸⁴ Martha R. Burt et al., "Homelessness: Programs and the People They Serve--Findings of the National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients," (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1999).
- ⁸⁵ Martha R. Burt et al, 1999.
- ⁸⁶ Laura Nichols and Barbara Gault, "The Effects of Welfare Reform on Housing Stability and Homelessness: Current Research Findings, Legislation and Programs". *Welfare Reform Network News: A Newsletter of the Institute for Women's Policy Research* 2, no. 2 (March 1999).
- ⁸⁷ Poverty statistics discussed in this section are estimates made by the Urban Research Division using Current Population Survey data. Estimates include non-cash resources like Food Stamps, housing benefits and the Earned Income Tax Credit in family income.
- ⁸⁸ Los Angeles single-mother poverty estimates are inaccurate because they are based on a small sample of approximately 250 families.
- ⁸⁹ Arloc Sherman, *Extreme Child Poverty Rises Sharply in 1997* (Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, August 22, 1999).
- ⁹⁰ Allen L. Schirm, "Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 1998" (Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2001).
- ⁹¹ CalWORKs and Food Stamps Data Systems Design Task Force, "Food Stamp Household Characteristics Survey: Social and Economic Characteristics of Families Receiving Food Stamps, Federal Fiscal Year 1998, October 1997 through September 1998," (Sacramento: California Department of Social Services, 1999).
- ⁹² Relative to the rest of the nation, California's caseload declines between 1994 and 1997 (16 percent) and its Food Stamps declines (2 percent) were both small. Wisconsin is California's opposite in these respects—it had high declines in both programs (59 percent and 15 percent, respectively). South Carolina, by contrast, had a higher Food Stamps participation rate than California (64 percent in 1998), but had a much deeper decline in welfare caseloads between 1994 and 1997 (44 percent). Allen L. Schirm, "Reaching Those in Need: Food Stamp Participation Rates in the States," (Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2000).
- ⁹³ Christopher Jencks and Joseph Swingle, "Without a Net: Whom the New Welfare Law Helps and Hurts," *The American Prospect* no. 3 (January 2000), 37–41.
- ⁹⁴ Pamela Loprest, *How Families That Left Welfare Are Doing: A National Picture*, New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families Series, no. B-1 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, August 1999).
- ⁹⁵ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Declines in Food Stamps and welfare participation: is there a connection?* Assessing the New Federalism Series, no. 99-13 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, October 1999).
- ⁹⁶ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Are the steep declines in Food Stamps participation linked to falling welfare caseloads?*, New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families Series, no. B-3, (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1999).

⁹⁷ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Are the steep declines in Food Stamps participation linked to falling welfare caseloads?*, New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families Series, no. B-3, (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1999), 2.

⁹⁸ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Declines in Food Stamps and welfare participation: is there a connection?* Assessing the New Federalism Series, no. 99-13 (The Urban Institute, October 1999).

⁹⁹ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Declines in Food Stamps and welfare participation: is there a connection?* Assessing the New Federalism Series, no. 99-13 (The Urban Institute, October 1999).

¹⁰⁰ Sheila Zedlewski and Sarah Brauner, *Are the steep declines in Food Stamps participation linked to falling welfare caseloads?*, New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families Series, no. B-3, (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1999).

¹⁰¹ People who are eligible for Medi-Cal, California's Medicaid program, are usually aged, blind or disabled, or are in families with children. Other people are also eligible, such as pregnant women, refugees, and those infected with tuberculosis. There are income limits for eligibility, but all CalWORKs participants are automatically eligible for Medi-Cal. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, as of July 1999 fewer than half of all California families with children assisted by Medi-Cal were CalWORKs-aided. Legislative Analyst's Office, *CALFACTS: California's Budget and Economy in Perspective* [LAO Report] (Legislative Analyst's Office, December 2000 [cited December 26 2000]); available from http://www.lao.ca.gov/2000_reports/calfacts/2000_calfacts_all.pdf.

¹⁰² Leighton Ku and Brian Bruen, *The Continuing Decline of Medicaid Coverage*, New Federalism: Issues and Options for State Series, no. A-37 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, September 1999).

¹⁰³ Most noncitizen legal immigrants are eligible for Medi-Cal. Undocumented immigrants are also eligible, but only for prenatal care, long-term care, and emergency services.

¹⁰⁴ Stephen Zuckerman et. al., *Health Policy for Low-Income People in California*. New Federalism: Highlights from State Reports (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, January 1998).

¹⁰⁵ United States Department of Health and Human Services, "The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)" *HHS Fact Sheet* (November 1, 1999) (Internet, WWW) <http://waisgate.hhs.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAIIdocID=3126121734+1+0+0&WAIAction=retrieve> (Accessed 07 March 2000).

¹⁰⁶ The reader should be advised that health insurance data prior to 1994 is not entirely comparable to data collected in 1994 and thereafter. The Current Population Survey, which measures health insurance coverage, implemented a new health insurance questionnaire design in 1994.

¹⁰⁷ Leighton Ku and Brian Bruen, *The Continuing Decline of Medicaid Coverage*, New Federalism: Issues and Options for State Series, no. A-37 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, September 1999).

¹⁰⁸ Department of Public Social Services, *DPSS Caseload Characteristics Report*, April 1998 and April 1999. The total Medi-Cal child caseload was calculated by adding CalWORKs-aided children, ages 0 to 17, with children aided under Medi-Cal only. The non-CalWORKs total included only the latter. A very small number of children covered by Medi-Cal but classified under other aid categories were not counted.

¹⁰⁹ California Legislative Analyst's Office, "Analysis of the 1999-00 Budget Bill: Health and Social Services", (Internet, WWW) http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_1999/health_ss/health_ss_toc_anl1999.html (Accessed 07 March 2000)

-
- ¹¹⁰ Marilyn Ellwood, *The Medicaid Eligibility Maze: Coverage Expands, But Enrollment Problems Persist. Findings From A Five State Study* (Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research Inc., September, 1999).
- ¹¹¹ California Legislative Analyst's Office, "Analysis of the 1999-00 Budget Bill: Health and Social Services", (Internet, WWW) http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_1999/health_ss/health_ss_toc_anl1999.html (Accessed 07 March 2000).
- ¹¹² Richard Wertheimer, and Kristin Moore, *Childbearing by Teens: Links to Welfare Reform*, New Federalism: Issues and Options for States Series, no. A-24 (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and Child Trends, Inc.) (Internet, WWW) <http://newFederalism.urban.org/html/anf24.html> (Accessed 25 February 2000).
- ¹¹³ Debra Boyer and David Fine, "Sexual Abuse as a Factor in Adolescent Pregnancy and Child Maltreatment" *Family Planning Perspectives* 24 no. 1 (1992).
- ¹¹⁴ United States General Accounting Office, *Welfare Dependency: Coordinated Community Efforts Can Better Serve Young At-Risk Teen Girls*. Report to the Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Finance, United States Senate. (Washington D.C.: Health, Education, and Human Services Division, May, 1995).
- ¹¹⁵ Center for Disease Control, "AIDS Falls From Top Fifteen Causes of Death; Teen Births, Homicides Decline, but no Change in Infant Mortality", *Births and Deaths, Preliminary Data for 1998*, (PHS) 47, no. 25 (1998), 99-1120.
- ¹¹⁶ The rate of births to teens per 1,000 births was also calculated. See Appendix A.
- ¹¹⁷ The numbers presented here are for all infants that were under 2,500 grams at the time of birth.
- ¹¹⁸ National Center for Health Statistics, *Health, United States, 1995* (Hyattsville, Maryland: Public Health Service, 1996), 99.
- ¹¹⁹ Due to data limitations, this report only looks at infants who died or were born after March 31, 1998. The sample was restricted to families that were aided for at least three months during this period in order to be able to plausibly link outcomes to CalWORKs.
- ¹²⁰ United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends, and Girlfriends* (Washington, D.C.: U.nited States Department of Justice, 1995).
- ¹²¹ Amy Johnson and Alicia Meckstroth, *Ancillary Services to Support Welfare to Work* (Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research Inc., 1998).
- ¹²² Mary Ann Allard, Randy Albelda, Mary Ellen Colten, and Carol Cosenza, *In Harm's Way? Domestic Violence, AFDC Receipt, and Welfare Reform in Massachusetts* (Boston: University of Massachusetts at Boston, 1997), 5, 17.
- ¹²³ See Susan Lloyd, "The Effects of Violence on Women's Employment." *Law and Policy* 19, no. 2 (April 1997b), 139-67.
- ¹²⁴ See R. Brandwein, "The Use of Public Welfare by Family Violence Victims: Implications of New Federal Welfare 'Reform'." (Paper presented at the Fifth International Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH, May 1997).

-
- ¹²⁵ Richard M. Tolman and Jody Raphael, "A Review of Research on Welfare and Domestic Violence," *Journal of Social Issues* (Forthcoming [cited November 28 2000]); available from http://www.ssw.umich.edu/trapped/jsi_tolman_final.pdf
- ¹²⁶ Thomas Moore and Vicky Selkove, *Domestic Violence Victims in Transition from Welfare to Work: Barriers to Self-Sufficiency and the W-2 Response* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: The Institute for Wisconsin's Future, September, 1999).
- ¹²⁷ See Susan Lloyd, "The Effects of Violence on Women's Employment." *Law and Policy* 19, no. 2 (April 1997), 139-67.
- ¹²⁸ Gwendolyn Mink, *Welfare's End* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
- ¹²⁹ Gwendolyn Mink, *Welfare's End* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
- ¹³⁰ Richard M. Tolman and Jody Raphael, "A Review of Research on Welfare and Domestic Violence," *Journal of Social Issues* (Forthcoming).
- ¹³¹ Similar language can be found in "The Domestic Violence Prevention Act," Section 6200 of the California Family Code.
- ¹³² The definition used by DPSS differs from the law enforcement definition by considering abuse that is not physical (e.g., "mental," and "economic") and that involves children. Under the rubric of "domestic violence," DPSS includes the following forms of abuse: "Battering or extreme cruelty caused by: 1) physical acts that resulted in or threatened to result in physical injury; 2) sexual abuse; 3) sexual activity involving a child in the home; 4) forced participation in sexual acts or activities; 5) threats or attempts at physical or sexual abuse; 6) mental abuse; 7) neglect or deprivation of medical care; 8) stalking; 9) economic abuse; or 10) tactics of power and control." County of Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services, *Los Angeles County CalWORKs Plan* [HTML] (January 6 1998 [cited November 27 2000]); available from http://dpss.co.la.ca.us/calworks.c/fnlstate_plan_body.htm.
- ¹³³ United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, *Child Maltreatment 1997: Reports from the States to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System*. (Washington, DC: United States. Government Printing Office, 1999).
- ¹³⁴ The reported numbers of cases for the United States and California include both substantiated— independently verified—and unsubstantiated cases of abuse and neglect. Since a high fraction of reports are never substantiated, these counts could be seen as inflated.
- ¹³⁵ United States Department of Health and Human Services, "The Scope and Problem of Child Maltreatment", February 2000, [Internet, WWW] <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/ncanprob.thm> [Accessed: 2 February 2000].
- ¹³⁶ California Legislative Analyst's Office, "Child Abuse and Neglect in California", January, 1996, (Internet, WWW) <http://www.lao.ca.gov/cw11096toc.html> (Accessed: 2 February 2000).
- ¹³⁷ United States Department of Health and Human Services, "The Scope and Problem of Child Maltreatment", February 2000, [Internet, WWW] <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/ncanprob.thm> [Accessed: 2 February 2000] p. 2.
- ¹³⁸ California Legislative Analyst's Office, "Child Abuse and Neglect in California", January, 1996, (Internet, WWW) <http://www.lao.ca.gov/cw11096toc.html> (Accessed: 2 February 2000).

¹³⁹ When DCFS receives a report of child abuse, it creates an Emergency Response case. The alleged abuse or neglect is, in most cases, never substantiated, and the case is dropped. When the case does become substantiated, it is normally reclassified within about a month after case opening. Since CES was unable to distinguish between Emergency Response substantiated cases and unsubstantiated referrals, the data reported here excludes Emergency Response cases. "New Cases of Substantiated Neglect" refer to those cases that were new to DCFS for that particular year. "Total Substantiated Cases of Neglect" refer to the total number of cases that were 'open' in the DCFS database (this includes new cases for that year and older cases that are still in the system). For the total number of substantiated cases of neglect, please see Appendix B.

¹⁴⁰ W. Steven Barnett, "Long Term Cognitive and Academic Effects of Early Childhood Education of Children in Poverty", *Preventive Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice & Theory* 27, no. 2 (March–April 1998), 204–207; C. Andre Mizell, "African American Men's Personal Sense of Mastery: The Consequences of the Adolescent Environment, Self-Concept and Adult Achievement", *Journal of Black Psychology* 25, no. 2 (May, 1999), 210–230; Virginia R. L. Plunkett, "Parents and Schools: Partnerships that Count", *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 2, no.4, (1997), 325–327; Renee Smith–Maddox, "The Social Networks and Resources of African American Eighth Graders: Evidence from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988", *Adolescence* 34, no. 13, (spring 1999), 169–83.

¹⁴¹ Javier Tapia, "The Schooling of Puerto Ricans: Philadelphia's Most Impoverished Community", *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (September 1998), 297–323.

¹⁴² Andre Mizell, "African American Men's Personal Sense of Mastery: The Consequences of the Adolescent Environment, Self-Concept and Adult Achievement", *Journal of Black Psychology* 25, no. 2 (May, 1999), 210–230.

¹⁴³ Food and Nutrition Service, United States Department of Agriculture, *Characteristics of the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Program Participants* (Alexandria, VA: United States Department of Agriculture: January 1987). "This paper provides selected data on the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). The study was compiled using data from the 1983–84 follow-up to the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs, also known as the NESNP-II. The NESNP-II data represent the only extensive review of both programs since the passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, which enacted a significant number of program reforms. ... The report finds that, for the NSLP, 38.8 million children were eligible to participate, with 80 per cent of those students using the service at least once a week. With regard to SBP, about 25 per cent of eligible students took part, and almost 43% of participants belonged to a household that received Food Stamps."

¹⁴⁴ The Stanford Achievement Test, a widely-used product of the Psychological Corporation, should not be confused with the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) better-known Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). ETS's SAT is typically used in college admissions and is administered to individual students. The Stanford Achievement Test is used for ranking both schools and individual students, and is administered to all primary and secondary school grades. "The Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition, (Stanford 9)" (San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation). (Internet, WWW) <http://www.hbem.com/trophy/achvtest/sat9view.htm>.

¹⁴⁵ Stephen J. Caldas and Carl III Bankston, "Effect of School Population Socioeconomic Status on Individual Academic Achievement", *Journal of Educational Research* 90, no. 5 (May–June, 1997), 269–77.

¹⁴⁶ See Appendix B for annual dropout rates for grades 9–12.

¹⁴⁷ See appendix B for table presenting SAT/9 scores.

¹⁴⁸ This conclusion is based on a comparison of time on aid for families with teens, as calculated by DPSS in its "CalWORKs Families with Teens in Los Angeles County, Caseload Characteristics, July 2000, Los Angeles County Totals" report against our calculations for all CalWORKs families for April 1998 through October 1999 shown in Table 3. For example, fully 59 percent of single-parent families with a teenager had been on aid for five years or more as of July 2000, whereas just under 41 percent of all single-parent families had been on aid that long as of October 1999. It is unlikely that changes in the overall caseload between October 1999 and July 2000 account for much of this 18 percentage point difference.

¹⁴⁹ See Appendix A for additional details on these focus groups and Appendix C for a focus group protocol.

¹⁵⁰ DPSS has taken steps to address legal immigrant concerns. In District Offices, it promotes the new citizenship process through the Immigration and Naturalization Service. CalWORKs District Offices display posters regarding aid, and make handout materials available to potential participants. Program applications are printed in several languages. In addition, DPSS has staff fluent in a variety of languages.

¹⁵¹ This was a small survey, with 142 respondents, 26 of them from Los Angeles County. The fact that it was a phone survey means that it is likely that the least-well-off leavers were underrepresented, since they would be harder to find (because of housing instability, including residence in homeless shelters), and might not be able to afford regular phone service. Data Systems and Survey Design Bureau, "CalWORKs Leavers Survey: A Statewide Telephone Survey of Former CalWORKs Recipients," (Sacramento: California Department of Social Services, Program Planning and Performance Division, Data Operations Branch, 2000).

¹⁵² This Urban Institute Study, based on their pre-CalWORKs 1997 National Study of American Families, found that 39 percent of former recipients had "Experienced time in last year when not able to pay mortgage, rent, or utility bills," compared to 35 percent of current welfare recipients. Although 18 percent of leavers reported that it was "often true" that they "Worried that food would run out before got money to buy more," 23 percent of current recipients gave this response. The fact that welfare benefits in California are more generous than the national average, however, raises questions about the likelihood that local recipients face more hardships than leavers. Pamela J. Loprest and Sheila R. Zedlewski, "Current and Former Welfare Recipients: How Do They Differ?" (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1999).

¹⁵³ The study was based on the linking of records from the California Department of Social Services on welfare receipt and records on employment and earnings from the California Employment Development Department (EDD). Earnings were measured in the third quarter of 1999 for adults who had been aided for at least one month during 1998 or 1999, but were not aided in this particular quarter. This report shows a lower proportion of "employed" persons (52 percent) than does the previously-cited California leavers phone survey (61 percent). EDD tend to slightly understate both employment and earnings because they do not include the self-employed, a small number of additional categories of workers, and they do not, for obvious reasons, count informal or "under the table" employment. Research and Development Division, "Characteristics and Employment of Current and Former CalWORKs Recipients: What We Know from State Administrative Data," (Sacramento: California Department of Social Services, 2000).

¹⁵⁴ The Washington study cited directly below found similar levels of Medicaid receipt—57 percent among children and 36 percent for adults—but much higher levels of Food Stamps receipt: 42 percent. This may represent a higher rate of success by Washington agencies in ensuring that eligible families receive Food Stamps, but it may also represent differences in Food Stamps eligibility between the states.

¹⁵⁵ This report was based on a telephone survey of 560 heads of single-parent families who left welfare between December 1997 and March 1998. Washington's "WorkFirst" program, its implementation of Federal TANF, was inaugurated in November 1997, two months before CalWORKs began. That the survey was conducted so soon after initial program implementation is a basis for exercising caution regarding the survey's findings. The findings, however, appear consistent with comparable surveys in other states. Management Reports and Data Analysis Division, "Washington's TANF Single Parent Families Shortly after Welfare: Survey of Families Which Exited TANF between December 1997 and March 1998," (Olympia, Washington: Program Research and Evaluation, DSHS Economic Services Administration, 1998).

¹⁵⁶ In summarizing research on welfare leavers through mid-1999, staff of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) observe that "Most recipients who leave welfare are finding jobs. ... [B]etween 50-70% are currently employed or have work earnings." They note, however, that "Most of the jobs pay between \$5.50 and \$7.00 per hour, higher than the minimum wage, but not enough to raise a family out of poverty." In a more recent article, NCSL reports that "Some state surveys found that the median income of newly working families is close to the poverty level, so that about half of the families earn less and about half earn more." This calculation leaves out non-workers, and "about half of this group do not have regular cash income." A recent GAO report bringing together several leavers' studies noted that 57 percent of Oklahoma families surveyed fell below the poverty line, and Indiana families appeared to be faring similarly. A Wisconsin study looked at poverty by family size, finding that "While 35 percent of the families with one child and 24 percent of the families with two children had earnings above the poverty level, only 11 percent of the families with three or more children did" (p. 20). These states all have lower benefits levels than California, and California's relatively generous earned income disregards may mean that California welfare families leave CalWORKs at a higher income level than do families from other states. This remains to be demonstrated. GAO, "Welfare Reform: Information on Former Recipients' Status," (Washington, DC: Government Accounting Office, 1999); Jack Tweedie, Dana reichert, and Matthew O'Connor, "Tracking Recipients after They Leave Welfare," (Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures, 1999); Jack Tweedie, "From D.C. to Des Moines—The Progress of Welfare Reform," *State Legislatures*, April (2001).

¹⁵⁷ Technically, the 39 percent whose cases were discontinued because they did not submit their CW-7 form and the 7 percent that DPSS was unable to locate have made themselves temporarily ineligible, but our meaning is that these families were not *otherwise* ineligible; the families had not exceeded income or resource limits or no longer included eligible children.

¹⁵⁸ Henry E. Brady and Barbara West Snow, *Data Systems and Statistical Requirements for the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996* (Web Version) (HTML) (University of California Data Archive and Technical Assistance [UC DATA]) December 10, 1996 [cited December 24 1998]; available from http://ucdata.berkeley.edu/new_web/pubs/NAS1196.html. Also, as Besharav, Germanis, and Rossi note, administrative records "may be inaccurate, particularly those that are unnecessary for determining program eligibility or benefit amounts. In addition, they may not be available for some outcomes or may cover only part of the population being studied." Douglas J. Besharav, Peter Germanis, and Peter H. Rossi, *Evaluating Welfare Reform: A Guide for Scholars and Practitioners* (PDF) (University of Maryland, 1997 [cited September 28 1999]); available from <http://www.welfareacademy.org/pubs/ewr/ewr.pdf>.

¹⁵⁹ Martha R. Burt, et al., *Homelessness Programs and the People They Serve: Findings of the National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1999). [Internet, WWW] <http://www.urban.org/housing/homeless/homeless.html> [Accessed 25 February 2000].